

DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

**JUAN MENDEZ, RENE VARGAS, FRANK
ORTIZ, REYNALDO RODRIGUEZ, and
JAIME GARCIA,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

HOVENSA, L.L.C.,

Defendant.

2002-CV-0169

**TO: Lee J. Rohn, Esq.
Onik'a Gilliam, Esq.**

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court for consideration upon Defendant HOVENSA, L.L.C.'s Motion to Reconsider the Oral Order Allegedly Made During March 31, 2008[,] Settlement Conference (Docket No. 470); Defendant HOVENSA, L.L.C.'s Motion For Reconsideration of Order Entered April 02, 2008 (Docket No. 474); and, Plaintiffs' Motion For Leave Pursuant to Rule 6(d) [sic] to File Sworn Testimony in Further Support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion For Reconsideration of Judge Savage's Oral Order (Docket No. 502).

Mendez v. HOVENSA, L.L.C

2002-CV-0169

Order

Page 2

Pursuant to Local Rule of Civil Procedure 7.3, parties may seek reconsideration of an order issued by a judge or magistrate judge of this Court based upon “1. intervening change in controlling law; 2. availability of new evidence, or; 3. the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice.” LRCi 7.3 (formerly, LRCi 7.4). It is widely recognized that the “purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” *Snith v. City of Chester*, 155 F.R.D. 95, 96 (E.D. Pa. 1994) (citation omitted). Such a motion “[i]s not a vehicle for registering disagreement with the court's initial decision, for rearguing matters already addressed by the court, or for raising arguments that could have been raised before but were not.” *Bostic v. AT & T of the Virgin Islands*, 312 F. Supp. 2d 731, 733 (D.V.I. 2004).

Having reviewed the motions for reconsideration and upon due consideration thereof, the Court finds that Defendant has not presented any new evidence nor has Defendant persuaded the Court that its previous orders require modification or reversal.

WHEREFORE, it is now hereby **ORDERED**:

1. Defendant HOVENSA, L.L.C.'s Motion to Reconsider the Oral Order Allegedly Made During March 31, 2008[,] Settlement Conference (Docket No. 470) is **DENIED**.

Mendez v. HOVENSA, L.L.C

2002-CV-0169

Order

Page 3

2. Defendant HOVENSA, L.L.C.'s Motion For Reconsideration of Order Entered April 02, 2008 (Docket No. 474) is **DENIED**.
3. Plaintiffs' Motion For Leave Pursuant to Rule 6(d) [sic] to File Sworn Testimony in Further Support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion For Reconsideration of Judge Savage's Oral Order (Docket No. 502) is **GRANTED**.

ENTER:

Dated: June 3, 2008

_____/s/
GEORGE W. CANNON, JR.
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE